



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

molecular motion in the surrounding medium. And the brilliant incandescence in Geissler, Crookes, and Tyndall tubes from minute increments of energy are well known.

This increase of temperature and radiation from small increments of energy in highly tenuous matter seems to be what we ought to expect from the phenomena of this force or energy when it is in the form of molar motion. We then measure it by the mass and velocity of the moving body; that is, by its momentum, and this momentum is what is convertible into heat when the movement is resisted.

Increase in velocity compensates for decrease in mass, and hence a small projectile, at high velocity, will do the same work as a larger projectile at lower velocity; and the momentum, in each case, can be converted into the same units of heat. For obviously the same reason, the intense velocity imparted to the gaseous products of an explosion of dynamite enables this highly tenuous matter to do precisely the same work on a hard rock, as a hammer of a million times the mass, but moving with only one-millionth of the velocity.

But there is necessarily a limit to this substitution of velocity for mass; and this limit is in the capacity of matter to embody the energy; and when the force of energy is applied to matter in the form of heat we ought to expect to find the same limit. This application in the form of heat may be made by conduction, when the whole energy imparted is absorbed; or by radiation when only so much as is not reflected, is absorbed; but the resulting phenomena are the same, whatever may be the process by which the absorption is accomplished.

The fact developed in spectrum analysis, that incandescent matter absorbs the same rays of light which it emits, seems to be another illustration of the law that the capacity of matter to receive radiant energy is limited, and in this case by its capacity to radiate the energy received.

If the evolution of heat and elevation of temperature results from resisted molecular motion, it necessarily follows, that a single molecule, moving in unconfined space, whatever may be its velocity, would be at the absolute zero of temperature. But this is mere speculation of no scientific value, because we have no evidence that a molecule can become separated from other molecules, nor that it is possible to place it where it could move without resistance.

But there is another induction of practical importance in sustaining the assumption that we have just made. If the effect of heat imparted to matter by conduction or radiation is to set up the molecular motion evidenced by expansion, and this work of molecular motion must be resisted before radiation begins, it necessarily follows that the number of molecules in the body receiving heat, and to which motion can be imparted; in other words, the density of tenuity of the matter, must be an element, determining, in some measure, the capacity of the matter to absorb heat.

This explains why the atmosphere decreases in temperature with increase of tenuity, upwards from the earth's surface; and why we can assume absolute zero in space entirely unoccupied by ponderable matter, if there is any space thus entirely unoccupied, notwithstanding the presence of potential or dynamic energy, because it is only in conjunction with ponderable matter (resisted molar or molecular motion) that dynamic energy develops elevation of temperature, and the other phenomena of heat.

It is obvious that force or energy in the form of molar motion is being constantly converted by impact or friction into the form of heat. Taking the earth as a whole, during

the period of human observation, this constant conversion of molar motion into heat has been compensated by a conversion of heat into molar motion, so that the equilibrium between the two forms of this force or energy has been preserved in terrestrial nature, and there has been no loss of motion nor increase of heat, since man began to observe nature and keep a record of his observations.

Resistance to movement, that is, to the work being done by the force or energy in molar motion, is necessary to convert the force or energy into the form of heat; and it may be that when this force of energy is applied to ponderable matter in the form of heat, and its proper work as heat is resisted, the surplus heat may be converted directly into molar motion.

It is certainly within the range of possibility, that, under certain conditions, a body of ponderable matter may receive increments of heat more rapidly than it can furnish work for it in the molecular motion of expansion, or discharge it by radiation or conduction; and, in such case, it seems inevitable that the body thus receiving more heat than it could furnish work for or discharge, if free to move, would be put in motion away from the source of heat, and that this motion would continue until a distance from the source of heat was reached, at which the heat received was not greater than could be employed in expansion or discharged in radiation and conduction.

Dr. Grove was inclined to the opinion that it was thus possible to convert heat directly into molar motion. He says, "There are, indeed, some delicate experiments which tend to prove that a repulsive action between separate masses is produced by heat. Fresnel found that mobile bodies heated in an exhausted receiver repelled each other to sensible distances; and Baden Powell found that the colored rings, usually called Newton's rings, change their breadth and position, when the glasses between which they appear are heated, in a manner which showed that the glasses repelled each other."<sup>1</sup>

But, however that may be, there is certainly a molar motion which always follows and evidences the molecular motion of expansion. The law that action and reaction must be equal and opposite, applies to molecular motion in a closed vessel. It is the operation of this law which secures uniform pressure in steam boilers, and other like devices for using gas expansion for mechanical purposes; and thus converts the molecular motion, evidenced by expansion, into molar motion.

DANIEL S. TROY.

(To be continued.)

#### LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

*\*\* Correspondents are requested to be as brief as possible. The writer's name is in all cases required as proof of good faith.*

*On request in advance, one hundred copies of the number containing his communication will be furnished free to any correspondent.*

*The editor will be glad to publish any queries consonant with the character of the journal.*

#### A Question in Physics.

CAN there be a crowding of the particles of a gas to a much smaller compass without its being markedly heated? Can a gas expand without being cooled? At first thought the answer would seem to be an emphatic *no* in both cases; but it would appear that these conditions may exist sometimes. *Science*, Vol. XV., p. 387, published the results obtained by direct determination of the heating of air when compressed by a pump connected by a long tube with the cylinder. A compression to ten inches above atmospheric pressure gave a heating of about 4° F., ignoring the heat lost to the sides of the cylinder. The corresponding expansion into the open air gave a cooling of about 4°, neglecting the

<sup>1</sup> "Correlation and Conservation of Forces," p. 41. D. Appleton & Co. 1890.

heating effect of the cylinder. These results were strongly combated by Professor Ferrel in *Science*, Vol. XVI., pp. 192 and 193, and also by Professor Marvin. Professor Ferrel published the well-known thermo-dynamic formula, given in *Science* for Feb. 19, and applying it to the heating in the above case found it  $43^{\circ}$  F. instead of the  $4^{\circ}$  found by the experiment. It would seem, however, that these experiments had not been controverted, and it is probable that their justness may yet be established. This problem is far-reaching in its application, and it is for this reason that it is dwelt upon at some length.

The formula given by Professor Ferrel applies only in cases where a gas is compressed directly by an external force, and when all the heat developed in the work of compression is concentrated in the gas. One of Joule's experiments will serve to elucidate this point. He determined the mechanical equivalent of heat by immersing the cylinder into which the air was to be compressed and the compressing pump in the same water bath, and then determining the amount of compression and the total heat developed. This shows at once the truth of the following proposition. If a gas when compressed is to be raised to the temperature indicated by theory, it is very essential that all the heat developed in the work of compression enter it. This proposition seems self-evident; nevertheless, it would seem that nearly all the errors that have entered the various discussions and theories regarding this matter have arisen from a neglect of this obvious statement.

We may analyze Joule's experiment in order to gain a clearer understanding of the problem. Suppose the compressing pump had been in a bath by itself, and the cylinder in another bath; also that no heat was lost in the passage of the air from the pump to the cylinder. Under these circumstances a good deal of the heat due to the action of the pump would have passed into its bath, and only a small portion would have been carried by the hot air into the cylinder. Let us consider that a certain definite amount of heating would have taken place if all the heat had entered the air in Joule's original experiment, the formula gives the rise as  $123^{\circ}$  F. if the initial temperature of the air had been  $60^{\circ}$ , and the compression was to two atmospheres. In the present instance, however, most of the heat would have been absorbed by the bath around the pump, and would not have been available for heating the compressed air in the cylinder. It is impossible to consider that the same amount of work would have sufficed to heat the water around the pump, and then would have developed heat enough to raise the temperature of the air in the cylinder  $123^{\circ}$ .

Again, suppose that the compressed air, before entering the cylinder, had its temperature lowered to the outside temperature; is it not plain that all the heat developed in the work of compression would be disposed of, and none at all would be available for heating the compressed air? We see, then, that it is entirely feasible to bring about certain conditions under which a gas may be greatly compressed without being heated.

Let us take two equal cylinders connected by a tube and compress the air in one, A, to three atmospheres, the air in the other, B, being at atmospheric pressure. Let the air in A be at the temperature of the outside air. On opening communication between the cylinders the air in A will be slightly chilled, owing to the work of imparting a certain velocity to those particles rushing into B; while the air in B will be heated slightly from the impact of the particles rushing out of A. All the heat due to the work of compression, however, will have disappeared, and none will be available for heating the air in B (See *Enc. Brit.*, Vol. XXII., p. 480, section 34).

Lastly, suppose that the air in A should be allowed to escape into the open air; the resistance to the rush of the air would be much less than in the last case, and hence a greater velocity would be imparted to the particles rushing from A, and the cooling would be slightly greater than before. The situation appears very plain, and there is no difficulty now in understanding why the earlier experimental heating and cooling was only  $4^{\circ}$ .

These views seem almost startling in their nature, and if true certainly have profound significance. Let us try to picture the real condition of the gas when under compression and flowing from one reservoir to another. The confined air has a certain po-

tential energy and a capacity for work; it may flow into any reservoir where the air is at atmospheric pressure without losing its potential energy, and hence, if none of its energy is lost, it cannot be used up in heating the air. Is it not like the water in a pond having a certain head or capacity for work? We may enlarge the pond, and allow the water to flow over a larger area; but the capacity for work will be diminished very slightly. X.

Feb. 23.

### The Balloon Problem.

THE problem of the amount of work done by the gas in a balloon expanding as the balloon rises, as proposed in *Science* for Feb. 19, may be much more significant than even the proposer has thought. Take a bag perfectly flexible and holding two cubic feet. Force out all the air and tie the neck. If we attempt to separate the sides, we shall find it impossible to do so; as the air presses upon it fifteen pounds to the square inch. Allow a cubic foot of dry air to enter and again close the bag. We shall find the same difficulty as before in further opening the bag. Consider that the air in the bag has been heated  $490^{\circ}$ , which will just fill the bag. To separate the molecules has required a work equivalent to lifting 2,160 pounds one foot, and for convenience we say that the gas in expanding has lifted the weight of the atmosphere. Is it proper, however, to think of the outside air as having been lifted? Has any more outside air been lifted than the 1.2 ounces that a cubic foot weighs? The work, then, has been internal and not external. This is a very important distinction. The external work has been only that required to lift the weight of air displaced.

This can be shown best, perhaps, by determining just how much change has taken place in the behavior of the bag to outside influences. If any external work has been done, we ought to be able to measure it. If the bag with its two cubic feet of air were left to itself, it would soar aloft, and it would require a weight of just 1.2 ounces to restrain it. We say the heated air displaces two cubic feet of air at the outside temperature; and since its density is just half that of the outside air, it can lift a weight equal to that of one cubic foot of air.

Instead of heating the air, let us connect the empty bag with a reservoir having a gas which has a density just half that of the air. Here the conditions are entirely changed. The reservoir, to all intents and purposes, is connected with the outside air, and when we connect the mouth of the bag with it, there is no more work required to expand the bag than if we had opened it into the outside air. In the case before, after closing the bag, we could not open it till some internal work had been done in expanding the air; but now that internal work is not needed, and the only work done by the gas in expanding the bag is that required to lift one cubic foot of air one foot. The lifting power of the bag is precisely the same as it was when it contained air at  $490^{\circ}$ . The amount of external work in expanding the bag, or capacity to do external work, is exactly the same.

Take the same bag, empty as at first, and connect it with a reservoir containing two cubic feet of air at the outside temperature but at a pressure of two atmospheres. The air will flow quickly into the bag and an equilibrium will be established with the pressure at one atmosphere in both the reservoir and bag. How much external work has been done? Has the air in expanding lifted an enormous weight? Certainly not; the external work has been equal to that required to lift two cubic feet of air, or 2.4 ounces, one foot. Here again we have entirely different conditions from those in the first case. On connecting the bag with the reservoir we virtually opened it to the outside air, and the outside air did all the work which in the first case was needed to be done in separating the particles of air, or in increasing their kinetic energy. We can see this at once by the following considerations. Open the bag into the free air; we can pull the sides apart to their fullest extent. Now connect the opened bag with the reservoir which has the air at the outside pressure, the conditions remain exactly as before, when the mouth of the bag was open to the outside air. Empty the bag and connect it with the reservoir. No change will take place, but the reservoir will virtually be connected with the outside air. Now gently force air